



Office of the Commissioner,
State Tax, Uttar Pradesh
(GST Section)

Letter No. GST/2024-25/ 95 /State Tax
Lucknow: Dated: 27, September, 2024

To,

All Zonal Additional Commissioner Grade -1,
Additional Commissioner Grade -2 (S.I.B.)
Joint Commissioner (Executive/Corporate Circle/ S.I.B)
State Tax, Uttar Pradesh.

Subject: Clarification regarding regularization of refund of IGST availed in contravention of rule 96(10) of UPGST Rules, 2017, in cases where the exporters had imported certain inputs without payment of integrated taxes and compensation cess - regarding.

Sub-rule (10) of rule 96 of Uttar Pradesh Goods and Services Tax Rules, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as "UPGST Rules") provides for a bar on availment of the refund of integrated tax (IGST) paid on export of goods or services, if benefits of certain concessional/exemption notifications, as specified in the said sub-rule, have been availed on inputs/raw materials imported or procured domestically. In this regard, references have been received from the field formations and trade/ industry wherein clarification has been sought on whether refund of integrated tax paid on exports of goods by a registered person can be regularized in a case where the registered person had initially imported inputs without payment of integrated tax and compensation cess, by availing the benefits under Notification No. 78/2017-Customs dated 13.10.2017 or Notification No. 79/2017-Customs dated 13.10.2017, but subsequently, at a later date, the said person has either paid the IGST and compensation cess, along with interest, on such imported inputs or is now willing to pay such IGST and compensation cess, along with interest.

2. The issue has been examined and in order to clarify the issue and to ensure uniformity in the implementation of the provisions of law across the field formations, the Commissioner, in exercise of its powers conferred by section 168 of the Uttar Pradesh Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as "UPGST Act"), hereby clarifies the following:

2.1 Vide Notification No. 435 dated 11.05.2020, an Explanation was inserted in sub-rule (10) of rule 96 of UPGST Rules retrospectively with effect from 23.10.2017, which reads as follows:

“Explanation. - For the purpose of this sub-rule, the benefit of the notifications mentioned therein shall not be considered to have been availed only where the registered person has paid Integrated Goods and Services Tax and Compensation Cess on inputs and has availed exemption of only Basic Customs Duty (BCD) under the said notifications.”


2.2 A bare perusal of the said Explanation, which was inserted with retrospective effect, reveals that in cases where the benefits of these exemption notifications have not been availed in respect of IGST and compensation cess, it shall be deemed that benefit of the said notifications has not been availed for the purpose of sub-rule (10) of rule 96 of UPGST Rules. Therefore, extension of logic given in the said Explanation may lead to a view that in cases where inputs were initially imported without payment of integrated tax and compensation cess but subsequently, IGST and compensation cess on such imported inputs is paid at a later date, along with interest, then in such cases, it can be considered that the benefits of notifications mentioned in clause (b) of sub-rule (10) of rule 96 of UPGST Rules have not been availed for the purpose of said sub-rule. Accordingly, refund of IGST claimed on exports made with payment of Integrated tax in such cases may not be considered to be in contravention of provisions of sub-rule (10) of rule 96 of UPGST Rules.

2.3. In view of the above, it is clarified that where the inputs were initially imported without payment of integrated tax and compensation cess by availing benefits under Notification No. 78/2017-Customs dated 13.10.2017 or Notification No. 79/2017-Customs dated 13.10.2017, but subsequently, IGST and compensation cess on such imported inputs are paid at a later date, along with interest, and the Bill of Entry in respect of the import of the said inputs is got reassessed through the jurisdictional Customs authorities to this effect, then the IGST, paid on exports of goods, refunded to the said exporter shall not be considered to be in contravention of provisions of sub-rule (10) of rule 96 of UPGST Rules.

3. It is requested that suitable trade notices may be issued to publicize the contents of this Circular.

4. Difficulty, if any, in implementation of the above instructions may please be brought to the notice of the Undersigned.

By Order,


(Dr. Nitin Bansal)

Commissioner, State Tax, U.P.

Copy To:

1. Joint Commissioner (J.C.), State Tax HQ, Louisiana for uploading the Circular on the Departmental Website.

Joint Commissioner (J.C.)
State Tax HQ, Louisiana